## **PATENT COOPERATION TREATY**

To:		PCT WRITTEN OPINION (PCT Rule 66)	
KEIL & SCHAAFHAUSEN Cronstettenstrasse 66 60322 Frankfurt am Main ALLEMAGNE KEIL&SCHAAFHAUSEN PATENTANWALTE  2 9. Juli 2004			
78.9.	149.11.	Date of mailing (day month year)	28/07/2004
Applicant's or agent's file reference 01P58W0		REPLY DUE  within 2 / 00 months/days from the above date of mailing	
International application No.	International filing date	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)
PCT/EP03/13501	01/12/2003		23/12/2002
International Patent Classification (IPC) o	r both national classificati	on and IPC	
	C10B49/00		
Applicant			
OUTOKUMPU OYJ et al.			
IV Lack of unity of invention V X Reasoned statement under citations and explanations  VI Certain documents cited VII Certain defects in the inter VIII Certain observations on the content of the conten	nion with regard to novelt  Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard supporting such statement  rnational application  the international application  to this opinion.  above. The applicant may, ule 66.2(d).	y, inventive step and in and to novelty, inventive to before the expiration of	e step or industrial applicability;
How? By submitting a written reply For the form and the langua  Also For an additional opportunit For the examiner's obligation For an informal communication.  If no reply is filed, the international purchased with the internation examination report must be established.	ge of the amendments, see  ty to submit amendments, n to consider amendments tion with the examiner, see reliminary examination re-	see Rule 66.8 and 66.9. see Rule 66.4. and/or arguments, see Rule 66.6.  port will be established	Rule 66.4bis.
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/		Authorized officer Examiner	e limits)
European Patent Office			

()

( )

## WRITTEN OPINION

( )

( )

International application No.

PCT/EP03/13501

Basis of the opinion

JC20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 22 JUN 2005

- 1. The basis of this written opinion is the application as originally filed.
- V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- 1. In light of the documents cited in the international search report, it is considered that the invention as defined in at least some of the claims does not appear to meet the criteria mentioned in Article 33(1) PCT, i.e. does not appear to be novel and/or to involve an inventive step (see international search report, in particular the documents cited X and/or Y and corresponding claims references).
- 2. If amendments are filed, the applicant should comply with the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT and indicate the basis of the amendments in the documents of the application as originally filed (Article 34 (2) (b) PCT) otherwise these amendments may not be taken into consideration for the establishment of the international preliminary examination report. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that if the application contains an unnecessary plurality of independent claims, no examination of any of the claims will be carried out.
- NB: Should the applicant decide to request detailed substantive examination, then an international preliminary examination report will normally be established directly. Exceptionally the examiner may draw up a second written opinion, should this be explicitly requested.